

August 29, 2005  
Case No. AUS920010137US1 (9000/24)  
Serial No.: 09/820,518  
Filed: March 29, 2001  
Page 5 of 8

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Wallerson rejected pending claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,801,926 to *Shisler*. The Applicant responds to this rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.112.

As to the rejection, the Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Wallerson's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-6 over *Shisler*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Shisler*. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the modification of *Shisler* must teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1-6. See, MPEP §2143. The Applicant respectfully asserts that Examiner Wallerson has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in view of the fact that the modification of *Shisler* as proposed by Examiner Wallerson fails to teach or suggest the following limitations of claims 1-6:

1. "printing a second report page when a total quantity of line items listed in the parts section exceeds said first number, said second page including a header subsection presenting a portion of the first set of information, a second parts subsection listing a second quantity of line items, said second quantity being less than or equal to a second number, and a footer subsection presenting a portion of the second set of information." as recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 5; and
2. "printing a third report page when a total quantity of line items listed in the parts section exceeds a summation of said first number and said second number, said third page including said header subsection, a third parts subsection listing a third quantity of line items, said third quantity being less than or equal to said second number, and said footer subsection" as recited in dependent claims 2, 4 and 6.

August 29, 2005  
Case No. AUS920010137US1 (9000/24)  
Serial No.: 09/820,518  
Filed: March 29, 2001  
Page 6 of 8

Specifically, as shown in FIG. 11A, *Shisler* teaches a page header section 1112 that prints at the top of a second page whenever a page break event occurs on the first page (e.g., a page overflow of the columnar section 1114) and a page footer section 1116 that prints at the bottom of the second page whenever the page break event occurs on the first page. See, *Shisler* at column 7, lines 10-40. From this teaching by *Shisler*, Examiner Wallerson respectfully asserts that it would have been obvious at the time of the present invention to modify *Shisler* to print a report on one or more additional pages if the report exceeded the capacity of columnar section 1114 where the additional pages would each include page header section 1112 and page footer section 1116. This assertion by Examiner Wallerson is erroneous for several reasons.

First, *Shisler* explicitly teaches a printing of a report on additional pages if the report exceeds the capacity of columnar section 1114 where the additional pages would all include page header section 1112 and page footer section 1116. Thus, there is no need to modify *Shisler* in order to achieve a printing of each additional page including page header section 1112 and page footer section 1116.

Second, this assertion by Examiner Wallerson fails to address the entirety of the underlined limitations of claims 1-6 as shown above. In particular, this assertion by Examiner Wallerson fails to address whether the information in page header section 1112 and page footer section 1116 as printed on the additional pages would be a portion of the information in page header section 1112 and page footer section 1116 as printed on the first page as required by claims 1-6.

August 29, 2005  
Case No. AUS920010137US1 (9000/24)  
Serial No.: 09/820,518  
Filed: March 29, 2001  
Page 7 of 8

Finally, Examiner Wallerson failed to identify some suggestion or motivation, either in *Shisler* or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify *Shisler* to encompass claims 1-6. In view of the fact that *Shisler* is silent as to any differences or concerns between the information in page header section 1112 and page footer section 1116 as printed on the first page and the information in page header section 1112 and page footer section 1116 as printed on any additional page, the Applicant respectfully asserts that there is no suggestion or motivation, *Shisler* or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify *Shisler* to encompass claims 1-6.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shisler* is therefore respectfully requested.

August 29, 2005  
Case No. AUS920010137US1 (9000/24)  
Serial No.: 09/820,518  
Filed: March 29, 2001  
Page 8 of 8


**SUMMARY**

Examiner Wallerson's rejection of claims 1-6 has been obviated by the remarks herein supporting an allowance of claim 1-6 over the art of record. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Wallerson is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: August 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,  
Hanh Kim Le

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank C Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicant